

Appl. No. 10/055,400
Amdt. dated June 21, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Receipt of the Office action dated March 21, 2005 is hereby acknowledged. In that action, the Examiner: 1) rejected claim 8 as allegedly indefinite; and 2) rejected claims 1-18 as allegedly anticipated by Gobin (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,229).

With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1-7 and 9-18, and cancel claim 8. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. CLAIM AMENDMENTS

With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1-5 and 9-18 to remove much of the preamble terminology. Further, Applicants amend claims 6-7 to remove the adapted to terminology. These amendments are without regard to the cited art, and are not narrowing amendments.

II. SECTION 112 REJECTIONS

With this Response, Applicants cancel claim 8, thus mooted the Section 112 rejection of the Office action dated March 21, 2005.

III. ART-BASED REJECTIONS

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Gobin.

Gobin is directed to a web based integrated customer interface for invoice reporting. (Gobin Title). In particular, in the Gobin Summary it is stated:

[T]he present invention provides a Web-based invoice viewing system for online presentation of various billing and invoice documents associated with network services provided to a customer.

(Gobin Col. 2, lines 1-16).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office action dated March 21, 2005 fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Claim 1 specifically recites, "using a web browser to select a service request from a set of predefined service requests..." The Office action cites Gobin Col. 2, lines 16-26 for an alleged teaching of this limitation. The cited location is reproduced below:

The present invention is operable by a customer having at a minimum, a workstation with an off-the-shelf Web browser and an Internet access. The system of the present invention includes a client

Appl. No. 10/055,400
Amdt. dated June 21, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2005

browser application typically downloaded by the Web browser over the Internet during a session initiation stage. The client browser application provides a common GUI capable of communicating securely with enterprise Intranet applications, allowing the customers access to their billing and invoice reports from anywhere and any platform in the world.

It does not follow from the cited location that Gobin teaches "using a web browser to select a service request from a set of predefined service requests.. ." For this reason alone, claim 1 should be allowed.

Further still, claim 1 requires "creating a case for the service request in a help-desk software system." The Office action cites Gobin Col. 2, line 65 - Col. 3, line 11 for an alleged teaching of this limitation. The cited location is reproduced below:

The present invention further includes a Java application/applet for providing the invoice viewing specific functionalities. The Java application/applet is typically invoked from the client browser application and is responsible for receiving customer requests and providing customer selected invoice documents at the customer workstation.

At the enterprise side, the present invention includes a number of web servers for managing customer sessions over the Internet. The web servers support a secure socket connection enabling encrypted communications between the client browser application and the web servers. The web servers are physically isolated and firewalled from the enterprise's internal network (Intranet) and also from the public Internet. In addition, the web servers are typically responsible for maintaining the client browser and Java application/applets for downloading to the client workstation.

It does not follow from the cited location that Gobin teaches "creating a case for the service request in a help-desk software system." For this additional reason, claim 1 should be allowed.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not rendered unpatentable by Gobin, and should be allowed together with all claims which depend from claim 1 (claims 2-4).

B. Claim 5

Claim 5 stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Gobin.

Appl. No. 10/055,400
Amdt. dated June 21, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2005

Gobin is directed to a web based integrated customer interface for invoice reporting. (Gobin Title). In particular, in the Gobin Summary it is stated:

[T]he present invention provides a Web-based invoice viewing system for online presentation of various billing and invoice documents associated with network services provided to a customer.

(Gobin Col. 2, lines 1-16).

Claim 5 specifically recites, "a web based user interface component, and wherein the web based user interface component allows a user to select a service request from a list of predefined service requests... ." Applicants respectfully submit that the Office action dated March 21, 2005 fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 5. The Office action cites Gobin Col. 19, lines 10-18 for an alleged teaching of this limitation. The cited location is reproduced below.

As described above, the online invoicing provides on-line visibility to various networkMCI Interact documents. In presenting various documents online to a customer, the GUI client application communicates to a online invoicing server via the proxy for retrieving up-to-date information which the server maintains. These documents are indexed and stored in the online Invoicing's database 655 (FIG. 6). The online invoicing server includes several processes for performing the indexing and storing of the documents.

It does not follow from the cited location that Gobin teaches "a web based user interface component, and wherein the web based user interface component allows a user to select a service request from a list of predefined service requests... ." For this reason alone, claim 5 should be allowed.

Claim 5 further requires, "a help-desk interface component in data communication with the approval component and the help-desk software program, the help-desk interface component creates cases in the help-desk software program." The Office action cites Gobin Col 20, lines 1-11 for an alleged teaching of this limitation. The cited section is reproduced below:

The online invoicing includes a DB2 database subsystem residing in a NOR4 mainframe. The subsystem further includes an object database and an index database. An online invoicing store process 1060 loads the compressed document to an online invoicing object

Appl. No. 10/055,400
Amdt. dated June 21, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2005

database and an online invoicing index load process 1080 stores index pointers to each document in the index database. An audit check is executed to ensure that the correct number of documents are added to the online invoicing databases during the object load and index load processes.

It does not follow from the cited location that Gobin teaches "a help-desk interface component in data communication with the approval component and the help-desk software program, the help-desk interface component creates cases in the help-desk software program." For this additional reason, claim 5 should be allowed.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is not rendered unpatentable by Gobin, and should be allowed together with all claims which depend from claim 5 (claims 6-7).

C. Claim 9

Claim 9 stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Gobin.

The rejection with respect to claim 9 is similarly deficient as the rejections with respect to claims 1 and 5. For example, claim 9 requires, "creating a case for each of the first and second service requests in help-desk software." The Office action cites Gobin Col. 20, lines 1-11 (reproduced above), which is *non sequitor* as to the limitations at issue.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is not rendered unpatentable by Gobin, and should be allowed together with all claims which depend from claim 9 (claims 10-15).

D. Claim 16

Claim 16 stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Gobin.

The rejection with respect to claim 16 is similarly deficient as the rejections with respect to claims 1, 5 and 9. For example, claim 16 requires, "creating a tracking entry in a help-desk software for the selected computer related service if the computer related service is approved." The Office action cites Gobin Col. 20, lines 1-11 (reproduced above), which is *non sequitor* as to the limitations at issue.

**Appl. No. 10/055,400
Amdt. dated June 21, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2005**


Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is not rendered unpatentable by Gobin, and should be allowed together with all claims which depend from claim 16 (claims 17-18).

IV. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark E. Scott
PTO Reg. No. 43,100
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400